

REMARKS

The present Amendment is response to the Office Action mailed September 9, 2005, in the above-identified application.

As an initial matter, Applicants appreciate the Examiner's willingness to discuss the application on numerous occasions during the week of October 10-14, 2005, and to conduct a telephone interview on the above-identified application on October 14, 2005.

In the present Amendment, claims 1 and 14 have been amended. This amendment of the claims was discussed with Examiner Verbitsky during the telephone interview of October 14, 2005. When discussing the present amendment of claims 1 and 14, Examiner Verbitsky stated that the claims now satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, and that the originally filed specification provides support for claims 1 and 14, as amended.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claim 1 as having an informality. Specifically, the Examiner asserted that the recitation "hard-held" should be replaced with --hand-held--. In response, claim 1 has been amended as recommended by the Examiner to replace "hard-held" with --hand-held--.

The Examiner objected to the specification as including material that was not supported by the originally filed disclosure (i.e. U.S. Patent No. 6,568,848). In view of the above-noted amendment of claims 1 and 14, Applicants respectfully assert that the Examiner's objection under 35 U.S.C. §132(a) has now been rendered moot.

The Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a). In view of the above-noted amendment of claims 1 and 14, Applicants respectfully assert that the objection under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a) has now been rendered moot.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. 2003/0202558 to Chung et

al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,000,845 to Tymkewicz et al. In response, Applicants respectfully assert that Chung is not a prior art reference because it was filed on April 30, 2002, which is later than the earliest filing date of the present application, which is September 20, 1999.

Applicants respectfully assert that independent claims 1 and 14 are patentable because none of the prior art references, either alone or in combination, teaches the features recited in claims 1 and 14.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Office Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that he telephone Applicants' Attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which he might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested Amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: October 17, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Michael J. Doherty

Registration No.: 40,592

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorney for Applicants